

REMARKS

I. Advisory Action

An examiner interview was conducted on June 20, 2007. While Applicant's representative and the Examiner were unable to come to an agreement, the Examiner did indicate that he would consider the proposed claim amendments in an After Final submission. In response to the AF Amendment, the Examiner mailed an Advisory Action indicating that the claim amendments would require further consideration and/or search. Accordingly, Applicant files this RCE.

II. 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claims 1-6 and 26-30 stand rejected as obvious in light of U.S. Patent No. 6,609,972 to Seelig et al. For the reasons set forth below, Applicant respectfully disagrees with the Examiner's position.

The present application is directed to a slot machine that incorporates a mechanical member having a dynamic member. The dynamic member moves in response to pre-established slot machine outcomes to reveal a concealed display device. The display device depicts a game award. Prior to the dynamic member activating, the display device is concealed from the player.

The cited reference to Seelig discloses a slot machine having a two columns of display devices on a slot machine topper surface and a movable mechanical member therebetween. In response to pre-established slot machine outcomes, the display devices each depict various game awards while the mechanical member moves up and down eventually stopping to identify one or more display devices thus identifying a game award.

The mechanical member disclosed in Seelig never conceals any of the series of display devices on the slot machine topper. The Examiner considers the concealment of the display device by the dynamic member to be a design choice. It is more than a design choice because the display device is now removed from the typical position (as shown in Seelig) on the machine topper surface creating a new structure. By placing the display device in the dynamic member, it is now separated from the slot machine topper surface. There is simply no mention or suggestion in Seelig of concealing a display device in a

dynamic member that activates to reveal the same.

Applicant has amended independent claims 1 and 26 to recite that the display device is integrated with said mechanical component. Once again, Seelig fails to mention or suggest a display device integrated with a mechanical member. With Seelig, the display devices are integrated into the machine topper in a conventional manner and are completely independent of the movable mechanical member. By integrating the display device into the mechanical member, the bonus game toppers of the slot machines become much more versatile. For example, game designers are no longer limited to the two-dimensional topper surface for placement of the display devices. The display devices can now be placed into projecting members (e.g., arms and hands as shown in Fig. 1-3 of the present application) extending from the topper. It further facilitates a much more exciting brand of bonus games including player interaction.

As Seelig fails to disclose the concealment of a display device by a dynamic member or the integration of the display device with the mechanical member, Seelig does not render independent claims 1 and 26 obvious. Consequently, dependent claims 2-6 and 27-30 cannot be rendered obvious either.

III. Conclusion

Based on the foregoing arguments, it is respectfully submitted that the application is now in condition for allowance and, accordingly, reconsideration and allowance are respectfully requested. Should any questions remain regarding the allowability of the application, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number indicated below.

Greenberg Traurig
3773 Howard Hughes Pkwy.
Suite 500 North
Las Vegas, Nevada 89109

Telephone : 702-792-3773
Facsimile : 702 792-9002

Respectfully submitted,

By: 

Rob L. Phillips
Registration No. 40,305

Date: August 15, 2007